



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/579,768

05/18/2006

Satoshi Mihara

21713-00058-US1

3575

30678

7590

03/19/2009

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
1875 EYE STREET, N.W.  
SUITE 1100  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

BUIE, NICOLE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/19/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/579,768	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MIHARA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> NICOLE M. BUIE	<b>Art Unit</b> 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

The amendment filed on 12/08/2008 has been entered. Claims 1 and 4-8 remain pending in the application. The previous objections to claims 3-8 are withdrawn in light of Applicants' amendment and cancelling of claims 2-3 and 8.

### ***Claim Objections***

**Claims 1 and 4-8** are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 1 recites H is a C<sub>1</sub> to C<sub>16</sub> hydrocarbon group. Appropriate correction is required. For the purpose of this Office Action, H will be treated as hydrogen and R as a C<sub>1</sub> to C<sub>16</sub> hydrocarbon.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claims 1 and 4-5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cruse et al. (US 2002/0055568).

**Regarding claim 1**, Cruse et al. discloses silane coupling agents (i.e. “3-trimethoxysilyl-1-propyl thiooctanoate”, “3-triethoxysilyl-1-propyl thiooctanoate”, [0030], claim 1). Cruse et al. discloses about 0.05 to about 20 of at least one silane coupling agent based on the amount of inorganic filler which meets the claimed range [0074]. Cruse et al. discloses adding silane to the

Art Unit: 1796

silica before adding the rubber [0045]. Therefore, the bulk density retention rate would be inherently possessed by the composition of Cruse et al.

**Regarding claims 4-5**, Cruse et al. discloses a rubber composition comprising a rubber component containing 100 parts by weight of at least one conjugated diene-based rubber and 5 to 100 parts by weight of surface-treated silica treated, on its surface in advance, with a silane coupling agent [0070]-[0074].

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

**Claims 1 and 4** are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, 4 and 6 of copending Application No. 11/573619.

Art Unit: 1796

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Application '619 recites a silane-coupling agent-treated silica where the silane coupling agent includes 3-triethoxysilylpropyl thioacetate, 3-trimethoxysilylpropyl thioacetate, 3-octanoylthiopropyl trimethoxysilane, or 3-octanoylthiopropyl tripropoxysilane (claim 2). Application '619 also recites 1 to 50 parts by mass of silane coupling agent (claim 1). Since the silica is treated with an overlapping range of silane coupling agent, the silica would inherently possess the bulk density of Application '619. Application '619 recites a similar rubber composition wherein the claimed amount of surface treated silica overlaps the instant claimed range (claims 4 and 6)

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/08/2008 with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of a new interpretation of Cruse et al. (US 2002/0055568) in light of Applicants' arguments about pre-treated silica. The following comments apply:

A) Applicants' argument that the use of pre-treated silica is not taught in Cruse et al. (P5) is not persuasive. Cruse et al. does teach the use of pre-treated silica [0045].

B) Applicants' assertion regarding unexpected results (P5) is not persuasive. Since claim 1 is anticipated by Cruse et al, the showing of unexpected results does not matter.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

**Claims 6-8** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the closest prior art of record, Cruse et al. (US 2002/0055568) does not teach or suggest the specific combinations of natural rubber and butadiene polymers [0070]-[0076]. Therefore, claims 6-8 are deemed nonobvious over the prior art of record.

***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NICOLE M. BUIE whose telephone number is (571)270-3879. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on (571)272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/N. M. B./  
Examiner, Art Unit 1796  
3/12/2009

*/Marc S. Zimmer/*

***Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796***